Cat. Reg. Nos.

STANFORD LIBRARIES MAY 13 1922

TORY CRITICISM IN THE QUARTERLY REVIEW

1809-1853

By WALTER GRAHAM

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, in the Faculty of Philosophy, Columbia University

NEW YORK
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS
1921

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
WITHDRAWN

3781
.72G

81
12G

TORY CRITICISM IN THE QUARTERLY REVIEW

1809-1853

By WALTER GRAHAM

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, in the Faculty of Philosophy, Columbia University

STANFORD LIBRARY

NEW YORK
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS
1921

Copyright, 1921
By Columbia University Press

Printed from type, March, 1921

292247

STANFORD LIBRARY

INSCRIBED TO

MY MOTHER

MY FIRST AND BEST TEACHER

INTRODUCTION

From the beginning, politics and the press have enjoyed a permanent sort of liaison. No division of the press has been entirely free from partisan influence. Even the essay sheet, that subtle leavener of public opinion, in the Eighteenth Century temperately aired Whig or Tory views. The daily and weekly newspaper press which followed it developed enormous political power. Tho the Tories seem to have secured the preponderance of influence in the daily press, the other party had more than its share in the numbers and weight of weekly organs, both London and "provincial." In weekly papers lay the real strength of the Whigs and Radicals in the early days of the Nineteenth Century. But politics were not confined to the newspaper press. From 1731, magazines and reviews carried on the warfare which "corantos" and "occurrences" had begun. The great reviews were the crowning triumph of the first century in the history of periodicals. Of these, the *Edinburgh* (Whig), the *Quarterly* (Tory), and the *Westminster* (Radical) were avowedly party organs, and their prodigious influence was due largely to the intelligent reading public to which they appealed. Until 1855, stamp taxes limited the power of the newspaper press. But in the first half of the Nineteenth Century the substantial quarterlies fed the three factions existing in England with stimulating food for political thought.

In any study of politics and the English press, certain marked tendencies are to be observed. In the first place, those who wished to attack or oppose the government had a ready weapon. Moreover, kings and ministers soon

learned that the only effective instrument for fighting the press was the press itself. Thus, it was into a world long accustomed to political warfare, carried on in every form of newspaper and periodical, that the two most pretentious organs of the kind, the *Edinburgh* and *Quarterly Reviews,* appeared in the first decade of the Nineteenth Century.

The principal purpose of this monograph is to attempt a detailed explanation of the criticism in the *Quarterly.* Such an explanation cannot be made, however, without taking into account the origins of both the *Quarterly* and the *Edinburgh,* and the long-standing duel between these partisan organs. It will be necessary, then, to consider the founding of the *Quarterly* and the *Edinburgh,* to examine in detail the political and social predilections of the former, and to show reasons for the evident animosity of the Tory[1] reviewers toward certain poets, before it can be well demonstrated to what extent the *Quarterly* critics were fair and discerning of genius, and how the term " Tory criticism " came—justly or unjustly—to be associated with narrowness and slander.

This essay is an abstract of a more extended study presented as a dissertation at Columbia University.

[1] The reason for using the word "Tory" in the title is brought out in the thesis, i.e., the fact that the *Review* remained loyal to the old-line Tories of the Eldon type.

I. THE ORIGIN OF THE *QUARTERLY REVIEW*

The initial publication of the *Quarterly Review* was a remarkable event, with far-reaching consequences. It came at a time when the stable, conservative classes of England saw their country imperiled by disloyalty and dissention within, which, cooperating with hostile forces without, bade fair to bring about disaster. Foreign affairs in 1808 were generally productive of gloom. Domestic affairs in England were little more encouraging. All these disquieting conditions combined to make the outlook a dismal one at the beginning of the year 1809, and inclined public opinion to consider an ignoble and temporary peace with France.

Altho the Tories returned to office in March, 1807, to remain in power for a period of twenty-three years, the Whigs were by no means mute. Outside parliamentary walls, the ideas of the Opposition steadily gained influence. A group of able young university men had arisen in the North in 1802, as outspoken champions of Whiggism. The periodical in which they gave expression to their views powerfully impressed on the staunch and loyal Tories the depressing effects of national affairs at home and abroad. The *Edinburgh Review,* thru seven years of national storm and stress, gave unconfuted utterance to Whig disaffection. First proposed by Sidney Smith in the spring of 1802, the *Edinburgh* was actually founded by Smith, Francis Jeffrey, and Francis Horner, altho Brougham is included in the list of founders usually given.[2] The *Edinburgh* became a

[2] Horner, in his journal of the following year (*Memoirs of Francis Horner,* Lon., 1853, i, 209, Sept. 30, 1803) says, "This review was concocted, about the end of last winter, between Jeffrey, Sidney Smith, and myself. The plan was immediately communicated to Murray,

formidable weapon in the hands of these talented young Whigs. Its immediate and lasting success was due partly to the spicy criticisms of contemporary works, partly to a very liberal editorial policy, and not a little to the great opportunity for such a publication at that time. It discovered a great public need, and many periodicals of a similar nature were established within the next half century.

Foremost among rival reviews was the *Quarterly*. In the flush of their success, the Whigs overstepped the bounds of moderation, and inevitable results were the estrangement of readers and that opposition from the Tories which led to the founding of the London periodical. The idea of opposing the *Edinburgh* by a similar review undoubtedly occurred to many men. This consideration granted, three agents may be named as chiefly responsible for the origin of the *Quarterly Review*: the Administration, represented by the Cannings, George and Stratford; the enterprising and far-sighted young publisher, John Murray; and the reaction of men like Southey and Scott from the harsh criticism of their own works in the *Edinburgh*.

It is hard to determine what individual first conceived the plan of a rival organ. Only two direct claims were made, one by Southey, which may be dismissed, the other by Stratford Canning, the diplomatist, a cousin of George Canning. While walking along Pall Mall one day, before

Allen, Hamilton; Brown, Brougham, and the two Thomsons, have gradually been made parties.'' Brougham was notoriously inaccurate, while the generally accepted statement by Sidney Smith (*Memoirs of the Reverend Sidney Smith*, Lon., 1869, p. 33) was his recollection after half a century. See L. E. Gates, *Essays of Francis Jeffrey*, Bos., 1894 (Introduction); *Cambridge History of English Literature*, xii, 157; and J. L. Haney, *Early Reviews and English Poets*, Phil., 1914, xxiv, for accounts of the origin, based on Smith's recollections.

he left England for Constantinople—certainly before July, 1808, and possibly before January—Stratford Canning made a plan for a Tory organ, conducted along the lines of the *Edinburgh*.[3] He proposed the idea to George Canning, who referred him with evident satisfaction to William Gifford. Stratford Canning declared that the name as well as the idea originated with him and his friends, and that he drew up the sketch of a prospectus. Later he introduced John Murray to William Gifford. This may have been the initial step toward the establishment of the *Quarterly*. Stratford Canning's part in originating this *Review* was at least an important one, for John Murray sent him a complimentary copy of the first number on March 12, 1809, and referred to it as " a work which owes its birth to your obliging countenance and introduction of me to Mr. Gifford."[4]

It is possible, however, that Stratford Canning's suggestion was anticipated by a letter which Murray wrote to George Canning as early as September 25, 1807, advising that some means equally popular ought to be adopted to counteract the dangerous tendency of the *Edinburgh*. Murray offered to engage his " arduous exertions " to promote its success.[5] As far as we know, Canning did not answer Murray's letter in writing, and it is probable—altho it cannot be proved—that in the delay before negotiations were taken up, the plans and suggestions which Stratford Canning and his friends had made were communicated to the minister and to William Gifford. At any rate, it was thru Stratford Canning that negotiations were finally opened with Murray. The meeting of Murray and

[3] S. Lane-Poole, *Life of Stratford Canning*, Lon., 1888, i, 192 ff.

[4] Smiles, *A Publisher and His Friends*, Lon., 1891, i, 152. Haney (*Early Reviews*, Phil., 1914, p. xxiv) states that Scott proposed to Gifford the founding of a Tory review. I can find no proof of this.

[5] Smiles, *A Publisher and His Friends*, i, 93.

Gifford was in January. It was not until the first of September, evidently, that Canning asked Gifford to take the editorship.[6]

But during the months before practical steps could be taken, Walter Scott was enlisted in support of the plan. Formerly a prominent contributor to the *Edinburgh*, he became alienated from the Scottish publication by a severe review of *Marmion* in April, 1808, by the general tone of the political articles, by the injudicious remarks of Constable's partner, Hunter, regarding a contract made with Scott for an edition of Swift, and by Constable's treatment of Weber, Scott's amanuensis. Murray had the astuteness to see that Scott's feelings were hurt, and easily secured him for the Tory review. Thus drawn into the *Quarterly* group, Scott soon became the chief figure. He was not the original suggestor of the *Review* "to some men in power," as Southey declared.[7] He was more than that. His letters to Gifford, Murray, Ellis, and his brother, Thomas Scott, indicate that his was the guiding hand during the critical period of its founding. Southey was nearer the truth when he called Scott the "proprietor."[8] The latter's letters of direction, encouragement, and warning to the men most interested, tell the story. Scott was almost the *creator* of the Tory organ. Many years later he referred with satisfaction to the time when he had "the principal share in erecting this *Review* which has since been so prosperous."[9]

[6] See Gifford's letter to Canning, Smiles, *A Publisher and His Friends*, ii, 163. For evidence that Murray did not make the first proposal to Gifford, Smiles, i, 82. I have not been able to find proof to support the assertion that "Scott successfully pressed the editorship upon Gifford" (Elliot, *Cambridge History of English Literature*, xii, 165).

[7] Warter, *Selections from the Letters of Robert Southey*, London, 1850, ii, 107.

[8] Warter, ii, 194.

[9] *Journal of Walter Scott*, N. Y., 1891, p. 15.

How indispensable he was to its success is shown clearly by Gifford's letters to him at this time.[10]

It is clear that the outstanding figure in the group of Tory conspirators, in the latter months of 1808, was Scott. Once the *Quarterly* was in existence, and the difficulties and dangers of its birth and infancy largely over, he threw the greater part of his valuable energy into other literary channels, believing it would be comparatively easy to keep the *Review* alive. Yet until he was sure of its success, he was the leading spirit in editorial councils, the driving personal force behind the project. Altho there was plenty of talent among the others engaged in the venture, he alone had the tact and adroitness to carry thru an enterprise which required so much delicacy. As Murray put it, "The defensive power of the Tories in this conflict with other principles and doctrines was undoubted, but without the generalship of Scott it would have been difficult to have drawn them into action at this time."[11]

Thus, the idea of a Tory organ to rival the *Edinburgh*, taking shape gradually in the minds of politicians, was adopted by an ambitious young publisher with his eyes on the future, and was finally brought to realization chiefly thru the genius and industry of the Scotchman, Walter Scott.

[10] *Familiar Letters of Sir Walter Scott*, Boston, 1895, App. I.
[11] Smiles, *A Publisher and His Friends*, i, 110.

II. POLITICAL AND SOCIAL BEARINGS OF THE *QUARTERLY REVIEW*

The eventful years in English history which saw the fall of Napoleon, the successful agitation for Parliamentary Reform, and the repeal of the Corn Laws, saw also the flourishing of a national literature that was never wholly dissociated from political feeling and controversy. Any study of a periodical's critical influence must necessarily comprehend its bearing on great questions of public interest. In the case of the *Quarterly Review,* there is another important reason for outlining such relations. Two prominent authors of the period, Scott and Southey, were among the chief spokesmen of the Tories in the early days of the century; and their opinions in a great measure determined the force and effect of the *Review's* partisan influence. Scott had a unique connection with the *Quarterly,* as is shown in the preceding chapter. But his work was not confined to proposing editorial policies and writing articles. He was the master strategist of the Tory camp, who invented the plan of defense to be carried on for counteracting the disastrous offensive warfare of the Whigs. Southey, beginning with a non-partisan pose, became, before the passage of the Reform Bill, one of the most conservative influences in the circle of the *Quarterly* pens, and helped to give the *Review* thruout a number of years the character of narrowness and intolerance which was peculiarly his own. This result came about, not because he wrote all the reviews on Spanish affairs, Catholic Emancipation, or Reform, but because he wrote a large number of those which, for one reason or another, made

the greatest impression on the English reading public. In the first place, it was his prophetic paper on Wellington that heralded the victory of Waterloo. Again, he was instrumental in modifying the *Quarterly's* tone regarding America, first by protesting to Murray against articles being published, and then by pitching the new key in a review of Timothy Dwight. In another case it was on account of the publicity given him by the surreptitious printing of *Wat Tyler,* as an invidious rejoinder to his essay on the *Rise and Progress of Popular Disaffection* and his notorious opposition to reforms of any kind. Finally, it was because he was several times allowed to express in the pages of the *Review* his own hide-bound hostility to the granting of Catholic Emancipation, and to the repeal of the Corn Laws.

In the minds of its founders, the political function of the *Review* was paramount. Literary criticism and general discussion were to cloak political propaganda. In some cases, almost complete drafts of articles were supplied by the Duke of Wellington, Sir Robert Peel, Lord Stanley, or some other authority of equal weight on the question of the day. Southey and other writers secured their material in this way. At the beginning, the partisan purpose of the Tory organ seemed so important that many of the articles were written by Canning himself.

The political character of the *Review* was a "string" of much delicacy—so Scott declared. Its partisan purpose must not be obvious at first. A character of evident impartiality and the maintenance of a high reputation in literature were considered equally important. So the *Quarterly* followed the lead of the *Edinburgh* in mingling artfully its politics with information and amusement. Scott's ideal for the *Review* was later enunciated for the *Edinburgh Annual Register*—it should not be partisan but "constitutional."[12]

[12] Lockhart, *Life of Scott,* N. Y., 1914, ii, 49.

And he believed that the Tory organ should not be held to advocating the cause of the Ministry on all occasions. Such subservience, he thought, would defeat its purpose. In this opinion Scott was supported by Southey and Croker.

Scott saw that the Whigs, having long been accustomed to cut, had in some degree lost their power to parry, so he advised the Tories to draw the fire of their opponents by an ironical touch here and there and an occasional *reductio ad absurdum*. The latter would be sure to make some violent retort. Then the Tories could come into close combat with better grace than if they had thrown down a formal defiance. His advice was followed; and in determining the bearings of the *Quarterly* on political questions during the early years of its career we may observe with what success this plan of Scott's was carried out.

The range of the *Quarterly's* work was broad and its contacts with the political and social life of the century were numerous. But we may profitably show the general attitude of the *Review* on a few of the vital matters which stirred English thought during the first half century. The war with Napoleon and the treatment of the neutral nations are especially important. Since the attitude of the *Quarterly* cannot be understood apart from a knowledge of the political opposition of the *Edinburgh*, it will be necessary to sketch some of the cut-and-parry strokes dealt during the first years of this long-standing duel.

i

The first task of the *Quarterly* was that of counteracting Whig defeatism. From the beginning of the year 1807, Brougham, Jeffrey, and other writers in the *Edinburgh* preached peace-at-any-price. Most irritating of these defeatist articles was the notable "Don Cevallos" review by Jeffrey, which lost the *Edinburgh* many readers and at least

one valuable contributor in the person of Walter Scott.[13] The Whiggish writers professed no faith in Canning's foreign policy. They saw no ultimate good in the plot to draw off Napoleon's strength by means of a Spanish uprising. Tory writers, on the other hand, upheld the ministerial policy, and did all in their power to give England faith in the Spanish cause. Canning wrote several of the reviews himself. George Ellis was responsible chiefly for the one in the first number of the *Quarterly*.[14] Southey wrote a later article defending Wellington. John Hookham Frere was defended from critics who blamed him for his part in the defeat of Sir John Moore. And in general the morale of the English was upheld by review after review in the *Quarterly*, written—in consonance with Scott's plan—as rejoinders to the *Edinburgh*.

ii

Directly connected with the foregoing were the attitudes of the two *Reviews* toward the course the Government had adopted by carrying out the rule of 1756 regarding neutral nations, which led to a war with America and much hard feeling between the two countries. Whig expression of opinion began in April, 1806, in a review by Jeffrey of the *Frauds of Neutral Flags*,[15] and for many years continued to emphasize the imprudence of provoking neutral nations. But James Stephen, James Barrow of the Admiralty, and other Tories supported the English ministry in its injudicious course thruout the war with Napoleon,

[13] *Edinburgh Review*, XIII, 215 ff. For authorship, see Copinger, *Authorship of the First One Hundred Numbers of Edinburgh Review*, Manchester, 1895, p. 14. See the same for all *Edinburgh* reviews.

[14] Article No. 1, Feb., 1809.

[15] *Edinburgh Review*, VIII, 1. This pamphlet was so applicable to the recent submarine crisis, that it was reprinted in an edition by Sir F. Piggott in 1917 (Univ. of London Press).

and—especially after the War of 1812—went on for many years heaping calumny upon the heads of Americans, who had been the foremost of neutral offenders. Famous among these masterpieces of derogation were Barrow's review of the Inchiquen letters (1815), and Basil Hall's review of Mrs. Trollope's *Domestic Manners of the Americans* (1832).[16] Altho the *Edinburgh Review* was not without blame in this matter regarding America, its attitude was far different from that of the Tory organ, as the answers of William Tudor, Paulding, and other Americans indicate, as well as the long article by James Mill in the first number of the *Westminster Review,* 1824. Southey, as early as 1823, saw the harm that was being done by these defamatory reviews in the *Quarterly,* and at Murray's request pitched a "new tone" in his review of Dwight's *Travels in New England and New York.*[17]

This vilification of America in the *Quarterly* which grew out of the obstinate English attitude toward neutral nations, seems to have had a definite political end to serve. Gifford, the Tory editor, told George Ticknor as much. Canning and other ministers countenanced the irritating propaganda to lessen emigration to the United States, to pander to the spirit of national jealousy, and to check the desires and demands for reform in English politics by confusing and misleading the English people with regard to the actual liberty enjoyed by American citizens. But the formidable defence made by American writers, and the vigorous protests made by the *Edinburgh,* the *Westminster Review,* and even *Blackwood's Magazine,* led Tory writers in the *Quarterly* finally to discontinue their attacks on our country and people.

[16] *Quarterly Review,* X, 494, and XLVII, 39.

[17] New Haven, 1823. See *Quarterly Review,* XXX, 1.

iii

The demand for Free Trade which grew out of the agitation for Corn Law repeal further illustrates the bearings of the *Quarterly* on questions of international—or more than domestic import. From the first clash of commercial and landed interests over the Act of 1815, *Quarterly* writers opposed the sentiment which favored a removal of all duties on foreign grain. Southey, in 1834, attacked the *Times,* which was pleading the case of the people. He and the Tory *Review* now favored a fluctuating duty, regarding the removal of all duty as destructive to agriculture in England. In 1842 Croker denounced the Anti-Corn Law League, as the "most dangerous combination of recent times," and with Tory obtuseness refused to admit that any urgent distress or wide-spread dissatisfaction existed. And when in 1845 the Whigs changed their attitude toward Protection, they were attacked by the *Quarterly* for conceding "to the inflammatory mob." The Tory writer appealed to the landed proprietors. Free Trade in corn would lead to Free Trade in everything. In 1846, just before the Bill was passed, Peel's sliding scale was selected by the *Quarterly* as the best way out of the difficulty. But soon after this, Peel was bitterly blamed for his change of attitude which had broken down the "only party in the country that could maintain any solid government," i.e., the Landed Interest.

iv

In its relation to the *Quarterly* the Reform crisis is especially interesting here, inasmuch as it involves Southey and his *Wat Tyler.* On Reform, as on other matters of domestic politics, Tory writers were for a long time wilfully blind. By 1825 the *Quarterly* is found to be lagging behind the more liberal Tory statesmen. Even the *Edinburgh* took

a half-hearted and compromising attitude toward reform at first. Its "see-saw" position was pointed out by James Mill, Byron,[18] and others. In fact it is doubtful if the Whigs would have raised the question at all had not the problem of limiting the power of the crown been involved. Whigs and Tories differed in their opinions of the cause of this clamor for reform; the former laid it to the Tory government under which it had become manifest, the latter believed it the result of seditious publications. It was evidently because of his holding the latter view that Southey, after the publication in the *Quarterly* in 1817 of his "Rise and Progress of Popular Disaffection," was subjected to the most damaging criticism of his career.[19] His review was a plea for more stringent restrictions. For it, Whigs and Radicals attacked him furiously. Hazlitt maliciously contrasted it with *Wat Tyler,* which had been lying somewhere in manuscript, while the fiery radicalism of its author had been cooling in the twenty-three years that intervened. Prompted by Hazlitt's notice, some of Southey's enemies had the drama printed. Southey tried to get an injunction to prevent further publication, but Lord Eldon, the chancellor, refused the injunction and denied any rights to the author, on the ground that it was a work dangerous to public welfare. William Smith made an attack on Southey in the House of Commons, reading from play and review. And to cap the climax, the virgin edition of *Wat Tyler* and Southey's reply to Smith were the objects of a review in the *Edinburgh,* a twenty-four page vivisection of Southey's political character which left him a ridiculous figure. Not until a year later did the Tories attempt to defend Southey, when John Rickman contributed a corrective

[18] *Westminster Review,* Jan., 1824, and Moore's *Life of Byron,* 1830, ii, 15.

[19] *Quarterly Review,* XVI, 511.

article to the *Quarterly*, which had more to do with Poor Laws than Reform.[20]

Southey wrote little more on Reform, but in the next fifteen years David Robinson, John Miller, and other Tory pens tried to stave off the approaching crisis by lengthy and truculent essays. Not before 1827 did the Tory organ admit any general demand for change, and then it scoffed at the extravagant expectations of reformers. Croker, in several tirades published around 1830, called Parliamentary Reform not a national wish but a party measure of the Whigs, and after October, 1831, begged the Peers not to permit a second reading. After the Bill had passed, he dwelt for many pages on the dire results which he and the Tories had predicted, and looked forward to a "triumphant restoration." The *Edinburgh* writers, on the other hand, pharisaically declared themselves to have been friends of Reform from the beginning.

V

The Catholic question was never a real bone of contention for the *Edinburgh* and *Quarterly*, so it will not be considered at length here. Canning's attitude toward Catholic claims caused Southey to declare to Murray that the *Quarterly* must take its choice between the statesman and the Church. Influenced by Southey's inflexible conservatism in matters religious, the *Quarterly* chose the Established Church. It opposed more and more bitterly any concessions to the Catholics, for the Church's great enemies were Dissent and Romanism. Southey wrote the first review directly opposing Catholic Emancipation.[21] It was a partial and hide-bound paper, and altho it met with royal

[20] *Quarterly Review*, XVIII, 259, Jan., 1818.

[21] *Quarterly Review*, XXXVIII, 535. Rickman furnished much of his information—Orlo Williams, *Life of John Rickman*, London, p. 203.

favor certainly did not increase the respect of Scott and other *Quarterly* pens. The *Times* attacked Southey for his antagonism and religious prejudice, and more uncomplimentary references were made to the author of *Wat Tyler.* In the meantime, the *Edinburgh* was favoring concessions to the Catholics. Henry Hallam, Sydney Smith, and Jeffrey pronounced it no party question at all, and wrote persuasively to counteract the religious prejudice of Southey and the *Quarterly.*

vi

The loyalty of the Tory quarterly to the Established Church in great measure explains its bearing on all questions relating to Ireland. Its staff always contained bishops and other theologians. The number of articles on religious subjects increased as the years went by and English thought became more and more controlled by religious interests. The majority of the *Quarterly's* readers undoubtedly belonged to the Church. It was only natural then that the *Review* should always defend the Establishment, and consider enemies of the Church of England enemies of religion itself. It opposed two great foes in particular—Popery and Dissent. It was in connection with the former that William George Ward's *Ideal of the Christian Church* was destructively reviewed in 1844, and with the latter that Sewell in 1839 reviewed Gladstone's *Church and State.*

When the Oxford Movement was in its earlier stages, it was intended by the editor that the *Quarterly* should follow the *media via.* The *Review* was disposed to defend Newman at first, apparently not realizing his tendencies. Sewell, who reviewed the *Tracts for the Times* in 1839, praised the Oxford men for their piety, learning and zeal, and condemned the ignorance of those who called the Movement the "Oxford heresy." But seven years later Milman

lamented in the *Quarterly* the fact that Newman had gone over to the Church of Rome. Only once more was the Movement referred to—two years later—when the desertions from the Church of England were belittled and regarded as "misgrowths and abortions" in the "abundant promise of the time."[22]

vii

The interest evinced by the *Quarterly* in bettering conditions for the poor—in Southey's impressive language "ameliorating"—was dictated by a desire to postpone as long as possible inevitable reforms. Toward the existing Poor Laws, during the first decade, the attitude of the *Quarterly* was that of John Rickman. He was a census taker and expert on population, and furnished Southey with nearly all the material the latter used in discussing the subject. Rickman, and the *Quarterly* reviewers as a group, did not wish any radical change in the Poor Laws. The "fatal innovation of 1795"—paying the wages of laborers out of the Poor Rate—was the chief objection to the Laws. Until 1834, the *Quarterly* urged measures directed toward reform, for the sake of "the preservation of order and the general protection of property." But in the Poor Law Enactment of June, 1835, it saw that the Whig Commission (led by Nassau Senior) had overshot the mark. The *Quarterly* had wished no fundamental change in the Elizabethan system of parish relief—only "ameliorations" enough to preserve the peace.

Because of his interest in bettering the condition of the poor, Lord Ashley, who carried the Factory Act of 1833, wrote in the *Quarterly* in 1836, stigmatizing the existing conditions in factories as evil.[23] He threw the *Quarterly* into line with Peel in favoring a ten-hour day. Ashley,

[22] *Quarterly Review*, LXIII, 525; LXXVII, 404; LXXXI, 131.
[23] *Quarterly Review*, LVII, 396.

however, was more interested in the religious aspect of the labor situation than any other, and it is notable that no other utterance on this important subject is to be found in the *Review.*

To a great extent because of the bearing of his theories on the question of the Poor Laws, Malthus was attacked, first by Southey in 1812 and 1818, and then by an unidentified reviewer in 1831. He and his followers were scored on account of their antagonism to the Poor Laws "for the last thirty years," and because of his theory of the necessity of a preventive check. The *Quarterly's* solution of the problem presented by the poor was emigration. Reviews were written to support those statesmen who were laboring for the systematic development of colonial possessions. The *Edinburgh* sided with Malthus from the first. At one time or another Malthus wrote for both reviews.

The early attitude of the *Quarterly* toward Malthus is comparable to its hostility to political science. Senior, Sadler, Malthus, Ricardo, and all the rest of them were called mistaken in their views, while Jones on rents was regarded as the most valuable book in the study of human welfare since Adam Smith.[24] No one now refers to Jones and few to Rickman, who because of his belief in the sacredness of private property was highly regarded by the Tories.

viii

To keep England safe for the aristocracy seems to have been the chief political end of the *Quarterly;* so, naturally, the rise of democracy in many forms thruout this period was vigorously opposed. John Wilson Croker and others kept the horrors of the French Revolution and the excesses of republicanism always before readers. Whigs, in some cases indulgently handled, when—as in the case of Sir

[24] *Quarterly Review,* XLVI, 81.

Samuel Romilly, John Cam Hobhouse, and Lord Brougham —they showed tendencies to extreme liberalism, were abused without stint. Burdett and Cartwright and the *Westminster Review*, Orator Hunt and John and Leigh Hunt of the *Examiner*, William Cobbett and the Birmingham group, were alike set upon during and after the long period of Tory ascendancy, in which English tendencies to Radicalism were crushed under a mass of repressive legislation. The *Quarterly* did its part in preventing for many years the attainment of the Radical goal, i.e., to secure for the people the control of Parliament.

ix

On all these major and minor issues, the feud between the *Quarterly* and *Edinburgh* was continued by more than one generation of Tory pens, along lines of the best journalistic tradition. The *Quarterly* did not keep close to the Tories of the various ministries. After 1822 it cannot be said to have represented the Government. But it spoke always for a certain very conservative attitude of mind, opposed to innovation and change—it was a pattern of old fidelity to British institutions. The memory of Burke and Pitt was ever fair to the writers in this *Review*, who helped to entrench the political principles and prejudices these statesmen had promulgated. Canning, Wellington and Peel were successively supported by the *Quarterly*, and each in turn left it far behind him—more "devoted to principles than to ministries."

The social attitude of the *Quarterly* during this half century was more representative of the Tories than were its politics. It was serenely acquiescent in the things that were. Its ridiculous assumption of social finality is illustrated in the reviews of Southey, Croker and Lockhart (its third editor), who were chiefly responsible for the later

character and influence of the *Review.* The aristocracy, which the *Quarterly* spoke for, assumed its own permanence with a conviction not to be stirred. The reviewers were too small or too short-sighted to see that the social order they championed was a thing of the dead past. To those who would hear, Manchester insurrections, bread riots, clamors for religious toleration and Chartism had much to say. But the *Quarterly* would not hear.

III. LITERARY CRITICISM IN THE *QUARTERLY*

If the two great quarterly reviews had much in common politically in the interests of the Landed Aristocracy, they likewise agreed fundamentally on matters of literary criticism. Both depended largely upon established standards, and uttered their verdicts with the same legalistic and all-knowing finality. Both followed critical traditions fostered by earlier periodicals. The leaning of both is to a great extent indicated by Jeffrey's famous pronunciamento in the first number of the *Edinburgh*; "Poetry, like religion, had its standards fixed long ago by certain inspired writers, whose authority it is no longer lawful to call in question."[25] Both agreed that critics were persons eminently fitted by a natural sensibility, as well as reflection and long experience, to perceive all the beauties that exist and settle the relative value of works of literature. "Taste" was thus regarded as in a measure inherent and to some extent acquired. Both reviews were loyal to Pope, and in them reviewers strongly defended classical principles. Cautious in literary verdicts as they were in political, neither review desired any great change from the established order of things, yet neither came out with any great partiality to the half-defunct classicism of the Eighteenth Century.

But the *Quarterly* was established to oppose the utterances of the northern Whigs. So on questions of literary merit, appreciably diverse positions were found on grounds where they were in fundamental agreement. One reason for the founding of the *Quarterly* was the fact that Scott,

[25] *Edinburgh Review*, I, 63, Oct., 1802.

Southey, and other Tories were smarting under the lash of carping Whiggish criticism. This led inevitably to the expression of critical opinion, the value of which was modified by political prejudice and favoritism. One of the most remarkable results of this divergence from the sacred criteria of the past in search of issues upon which to defend patrons of Tory favor is manifested in the more liberal attitude of the *Quarterly* toward novelty, whether it appeared in the method or the material of literary work. A virtual championship of the "Lake School" was the result, altho the *Quarterly* always refused to recognize that this term had any value as a name. In defence of Scott and Southey, this countenance of novelty was most often expressed; and often these two were the defenders.

Before discussing in detail the writers reviewed, one other important consideration must be noted. The *Quarterly* was, above all else, the defender of the Established Church, the palladium of privileged Aristocracy. Religion and the Law, the King and a narrow, orthodox morality, could not be forgotten. The *Edinburgh's* critical articles often contained political aspersions, and Jeffrey frequently formed his judgments on other than literary grounds. But it is true and natural that *Quarterly* reviewers showed a much greater inclination to partiality on matters affecting Church and Crown. Whatever tended to decrease general respect for the established order, the Church, the monarchical form of government, the laws, the King, and the Landed Aristocracy was evil. Modified and varied by its applications, this was always the major consideration.

The blindness to relative merit shown by the early Tory reviewers was the result of many causes and conditions. It has been greatly emphasized by critics, scholars, and teachers; while on the other hand the really valuable and constructive criticism in the *Quarterly*—and it greatly out-

weighs the unjust and censorious work—has been too largely overlooked. But to estimate the critical value of the *Review* in the first half of the Nineteenth Century we ought to consider in more detail its treatment of the great writers of that period. We should find the historical reasons for its success or failure. Finally, we should sum up the good and evil resulting from the verdicts of this organ during those years of abundance in English literature, and show that the balance falls on the appreciative and constructive side.

i

Considering first the infamous reviews of the earlier days, one must begin with Croker's article on Keat's *Endymion.*[26] This well known attack on an obscure poet cannot be called literary criticism, as we use the term, for Croker admitted he had not read the entire poem. For the motives which prompted the assault, we must look to the relations of Keats and Leigh Hunt. In fairness to Croker, it must be admitted that he exposed a few of the worst effects of Hunt's baleful influence on the young poet's style. The review was short and much less damaging than is generally believed. It was not nearly so scurrilous as those of Hazlitt and Shelley. But it was stupid. Egregious failure to see the golden promise of Keats, is the most unforgivable thing about it. This is the more inexcusable, since the *Quarterly,* unlike *Blackwood's* and the *Edinburgh,* never in after years admitted its mistake. Probably much of the notoriety of this article was set going by Shelley in the widely-credited fiction that the paper killed Keats. Keats wrote his brother that the criticism actually did him good—it had got his poem "some notice."[27] He

[26] For alphabetical list of authors reviewed and references to the reviews, see Appendix.

[27] See *Letters,* Ed. of H. Buxton Forman, Letter lxxxi.

himself and Shelley both admitted the justice of part, at least, of the censure.

The real target of Croker and the Tories was Leigh Hunt, who fairly gloried in his war with his adversaries. His unprovoked attack on Gifford, in the *Feast of the Poets* (1814), as well as his connection with the liberal *Examiner,* marked him out for abuse by the Tories. Hunt's "systematic" revival of epicureanism, his undermining of the influence of Christianity, his "impure" language and sentiment, were denounced. Lockhart in *Blackwood's* was calling him a "bad, reckless unbeliever." He lacked sound principle and Christian humility. Consequently, his every work and his character, as well, were reviled. *Lord Byron and His Contemporaries* (1828) brought the crowning attack. It was by Lockhart—now editor of the *Quarterly.* The work of Hunt was stigmatized as the miserable book of a miserable man. After condemning Hunt for his political Liberalism, the writer, with consummate invective, called him "one who could touch nothing which mankind would wish to preserve, without polluting it."

The third prominent author of the period to feel the "merciless tomahawk" of the reviewers in the *Quarterly* was Shelley, who was first mentioned with Hunt in the review of *Foliage.* John Taylor Coleridge was the writer who introduced Shelley to the *Quarterly's* inhospitable columns. Godwinian lawlessness, atheism and utter lack of moral scruples, were the evils which operated to reduce his rank as a poet. *Laon and Cythna* was found "laboriously obscene," because the author would have men return to a state of life in accordance with distorted ideas he had derived from *Political Justice.* Love in Shelley, the writer found, was not the highest kind—the fulfilling of the Law. It was the lowest, most degraded. Shelley scorned repentance and faith, the two principles upon which Christianity

was built. Coleridge pitied the sinner and recommended to him a study of the Bible. He drew a dark picture of the poet's ultimate condition on this earth, and hinted that his private life was disgusting.

The second castigation of Shelley was by W. S. Walker, of Cambridge, and was quite as unjust as Coleridge's. *Prometheus Unbound,* Walker said, showed that Shelley could write in a style absolutely and intrinsically unintelligible. Sometimes Shelley became ugly and impious. His poetry lacked music, his rhythm was harsh and inharmonious. He had not written good poetry, therefore he lacked poetic power. Walker scoffed at his "beautiful idealisms" of moral excellence. Shelley's poetry was drivelling prose run mad. He derided Shelley's declaration that his intentions were pure. He, the reviewer, must discharge the "sacred duty" of exposing the character and tendency of these writings, because they were at war with all that dignifies man and all that man reveres.

From 1819, *Blackwood's* did not withhold praise due a poet now regarded as of the first order. And the *Quarterly* group evidently saw that the *Review* was suffering more than Shelley; for when Shelley's fragmentary translation of *Faust* came to Lockhart's attention, the tone of Tory criticism in this organ changed. This "unfortunate and misguided gentleman" had a fine ear for harmony and a great command over poetical language. He lacked little, Lockhart said, to be a distinguished original poet.

William Hazlitt, the doughty essayist, who made an unprovoked attack on Gifford in the *Spirit of the Age,* and earlier wrote the brutal *Letter,* is the last of four prominent figures who seemed selected for especial contumely. The savage assaults of the Tories on Hazlitt are easily explained by political prejudice at first, then by very human and acrimonious personal feeling. The *Round Table* essays,

reprinted from Hunt's *Examiner,* were objects of James Russell's vituperation. Begun thus, the duel between Hazlitt and the Tories was long and merry. The *Characters of Shakespeare's Plays,* the *English Poets, Table Talk,* were but pegs upon which to hang the scathing and abusive attacks on Hazlitt's character and political opinions. No attempt was made to estimate his work as literature. The essayist struck blow for blow, and went to just as unfair extremes as his antagonists. For once the Tories had caught a Tartar. The quarrel was a disgraceful one for both parties. But the pity is that owing to political prejudice and personal spite, Tory critics failed to recognize the merits of one who soon took an assured position among the best prose writers of his time.

ii

The grievances which Charles Lamb held against the *Quarterly* have been and may easily be overstated. No review of his work appeared before Gifford's resignation in 1824, but he enlarged with great feeling upon four slighting allusions which were made to him. Gifford, knowing nothing of Lamb's unfortunate family circumstances, referred to Lamb's comments on Ford's *Broken Heart* as the "blasphemies of a poor maniac." He meant to convey that he did not, for religious reasons, approve Lamb's notes. When Gifford learned the facts about Lamb, he was sincerely regretful. His expression was unpardonable, of course, whatever critical tradition he followed. But in fairness to Gifford, we should note that seven years later a writer in *Blackwood's* referred to the same notes of Lamb as "ill-advised, impious, and irreverent."[28] Lamb in 1814 was asked by Wordsworth to review the *Excursion* in the *Quarterly,* obviously so that it should receive friendly

[28] *Blackwood's,* III, 599, Aug., 1818.

treatment. Lamb seems to have welcomed the opportunity to write for the *Quarterly*. At least the remarks of Gifford in 1811 did not now deter him. When the review appeared, however, Lamb set up a great cry about the alterations Gifford had made. He had so cut up the review as to make "absolute nonsense." But here again Lamb seems to have been over-sensitive. It is difficult to discover any passages that are "absolute nonsense," and certainly the main issues and criticisms are still in the style and manner of Lamb. Likewise, an allusion to Lamb's "Confessions of a Drunkard" in 1822, in a review of Reid on nervous diseases, with the comment that this was a true tale of Lamb's experience, and a reference to *Elia* in 1823 by Southey (On the Progress of Infidelity) with an implication that Lamb was in need of sounder religious feeling, were enlarged upon by the sensitive essayist. There is no evidence that Lamb's reputation as author or gentleman was impaired by these four references. The thoroly appreciative review of the *Last Essays of Elia*, which appeared the year after his death, acknowledged him "not the greatest, but the most singular and individual of his contemporaries."

iii

Wordsworth, himself a Tory in the days of the *Quarterly*, had nothing to complain of. He selected his first critic—an unusual privilege—and thru the influence of Southey, succeeded in getting his *Excursion* thus favorably presented to the public. Altho Murray's records indicate that Gifford claimed part authorship, no division is evident in the review. It was the most favorable notice of Wordsworth that had appeared up to this time, and served to counteract Jeffrey's famous derogation of the poet. Bishop Lyall's article on the poems of 1815 is not as laudatory as Lamb's estimate, but is on the whole a favorable review.

He took exception to Wordsworth's theories of poetic diction, however, and pointed out that the poet wrote better when he laid his theories aside. These two reviews constitute the criticism of Wordsworth which appeared in the *Quarterly* within Gifford's lifetime; but after Lockhart took the throne in 1826, four signal appreciations of the poet's work were published. Henry Taylor's review of the sonnets of 1838 includes the group on punishment by death, here put in print for the first time; while the last of the four articles was an excellent summary by Whitwell Elwin of the poet's accomplishment.

In the later years the *Quarterly* had much to say about Wordsworth and Coleridge—"a great pair who go together." The obligation of English thought to this pair was pointed out in 1840, and a year later a reviewer ascribed to them the great revolution in public taste. Sir Henry Taylor in 1842 associated them with two other Tories, Scott and Southey, as the greatest poets of the age. Considered alone, Coleridge, like Wordsworth, grew in the estimation of the *Quarterly* reviewers as he became older and more orthodox. Only one review appeared during Gifford's lifetime—that of *Remorse,* written by his nephew, J. T. Coleridge—and altho this was a just and favorable criticism, Coleridge expressed himself hurt by the silent, injurious detraction of the Tories. Probably the failure of the *Quarterly* to notice *Christabel* in 1816 was the unkindest cut of all. After the poet's death, a kind of posthumous restitution was made both in the *Quarterly* and *Blackwood's,* the review in the former written by another nephew, Henry Nelson Coleridge. The collected works, 1834, brought very high praise from the Tory critics, and many of the appreciative sentences written at this time are now regarded as the commonplaces of English literary criticism.

iv

No more favorable examples exist of the discernment of *Quarterly* reviewers than their criticisms of Maria Edgeworth and Jane Austen. The appreciation of the former was begun in 1809 by Croker, who took up the first three volumes of the *Tales of Fashionable Life.* No fault was found with her except that she excluded religious instruction from her system of education. Reviewing the next three *Tales* in 1812, Croker declared that in truth to nature and in the manner of the persons included, Miss Edgeworth was without a rival, except the authors of *Gil Blas* and *Don Quixote.* He also pointed to the splendid individuality of her persons, and the skill with which she inculcated her lessons—to him the most important thing of all.

When Scott, in the introduction to his review of Jane Austen's *Emma* (1815), elaborately attempted to justify his conduct in criticizing a novel, he was pleading his own case as well as that of the author he reviewed. His critique was cordially appreciative of the merits of Miss Austen as a novelist. He put her work into the same general category as that of Miss Edgeworth. Both have the " exquisite touch that renders ordinary life interesting " Both " furnish examples of the new novel," which draws its characters from the atmosphere of common day. This review contains sketches of the plots of *Sense and Sensibility* and *Pride and Prejudice,* as well as *Emma,* and is well designed to stir the public with a desire to peruse these novels more fully. Equally appreciative was Dr. Richard Whately, writing of *Northanger Abbey* and *Persuasion* several years later. It was after the novelist's death. Whately declared the time was past for apologizing for novels, and thought this change to be due more to the character of the novels than to the public. The most valuable of his many commendations was that in which he showed Miss Austen's

minuteness to be a virtue rather than a fault. In view of the present high valuation of Jane Austen, the least we can do is to recognize the literary discernment of Scott and Whately. In their two articles, her work was evaluated in 1820, soon after her death, much as it is today. Meanwhile the *Edinburgh Review* had entirely failed to notice her.

V

The "New Whigs," Moore, Campbell, and Rogers, were generally well treated in the columns of the *Quarterly,* as might have been anticipated from the classical proclivities of the last two. The faults which posterity found in them were early pointed out by Scott, the Earl of Dudley, and Henry Taylor. Perhaps this fact is more likely to cause surprise. Horace Twiss, who wrote the first review of *Irish Melodies* (1812), was altogether too eulogistic. Taylor, who wrote the second, was more just: he concluded that fervor of sincerity, not depth of constancy or feeling was Moore's secret; and that in this kind of writing he was not likely to be surpassed by anyone. Scott found Campbell's *Gertrude of Wyoming* impaired by over-polishing, praised it for seriousness and pathos, and pointed out many and palpable faults. His review was much less favorable than Jeffrey's. Several other reviewers from time to time pointed out Campbell's declining powers or endeavored to render him service as his popularity waned. Finally, his collected works in 1836 were generously handled by William Henry Smith, who thought no writer of the time more likely to have something live. In the case of Rogers, again, the *Quarterly* was less favorable and more just than the *Edinburgh.* The Earl of Dudley found that Rogers had failed in *Columbus,* because he had not stuck to his earlier "safe and correct models of excellence," Pope and Goldsmith.

vi

Walter Savage Landor's poetry was once within this period appraised very sympathetically. His admirer, Southey, reviewed *Count Julian* in 1812, with extravagant and unwarranted praise. Henry Taylor, on the other hand, writing of the *Imaginary Conversations* in 1824, was far from eulogistic. His grievance against the author was—as may be guessed—a political one. The *Conversations* are described as merely excuses for Landor's preaching the most violent opinions of all parties. Finally, William Smith in 1837 remarks on the unequal merit of the *Conversations.* Again the "tumid stream of Landor's politics" evidently gives the Tory reviewer pause. "Pitt and Canning" and "Penn and Peterborough" give special offence. The grounds of the *Quarterly's* unconcealed hostility are obvious.

Another author of classical tendencies, who received less qualified appreciation in the Scotch quarterly than in the English was Crabbe. His *Borough* was the subject of long reviews in both. Jeffrey in April, 1810, was extremely complimentary; he liked the lucidity of Crabbe's style, his lack of mysticism, and the accuracy of his detailed landscape painting. Gifford, in November of the same year, looked upon Crabbe with far less favor. He defended imagination, to which Crabbe's doctrines were hostile, as the illusory and vital element of poetry. The article is a deliberate answer to Jeffrey. Lockhart, in two reviews in 1834, was more favorable to the poet. But neither review contains any real criticism. The moral and Christian aspects of Crabbe's work were stressed.

vii

Prior to 1821, no critical review of any American work of literature of the first order had appeared in the *Quar-*

terly. Irving's *Sketch Book,* coming from the press of Murray about this time, however, was given a very creditable appreciation by Henry Matthews. Altho Irving's sprightliness and elegance of style and his faculty for the lively transmission of sensations and impressions were commended, Matthews could not resist the opportunity to take a side-thrust at the American people. The political aspersions, however, have nothing to do with Irving, who must have been well satisfied with the notice his book received. Later *Granada* was well reviewed by the author himself, in the hope of stimulating the sale. The article was largely an explanation of Irving's method.

viii

In *Quarterly* criticism there are three outstanding figures: Southey, Scott, and Byron. Two were most essential to the early success of the *Review.* The last was Murray's lion, the literary son of Gifford, the revered idol of all the Tory pens, in spite of his liberal and erratic politics. One of the foremost issues between the two reviews was the work of Scott and Southey; one of the reasons for founding the *Quarterly* was the unsatisfactory treatment they had received at the hands of Jeffrey and the *Edinburgh* reviewers. Many of the reviews of Scott and Southey, therefore, necessarily contribute to the duel, as the critics of the two organs, like the political controvertists, cut and parry.

Jeffrey's first attack on Southey, which appeared in the initial number of the *Edinburgh,* was in truth an arraignment of the "sect" of poets, later known as the "Lake School." Jeffrey condemned Wordsworth and Southey as the worst examples. They were dissenters from the fixed standards of poetry, which were not to be tampered with. In 1811, Scott took up the gauntlet in defence of Southey in a review of *Kehama.* Three years later,

Southey's good friend, Grosvenor Bedford, made *Roderick, the Last of the Goths,* excuse for a general defence of the Laureate and foremost Tory reviewer. *Carmen Triumphale* (1813) was discreetly ignored by the *Quarterly* and ridiculed by the *Edinburgh.*[29] In 1825, J. T. Coleridge thought Southey might well be content to rest on the fame *Don Roderick* had brought him. The *Tale of Paraguay* and *History of Brazil* are here puffed inordinately. The religious nature of *Colloquies on the Progress and Prospects of Society* brought applause from Milman in the *Quarterly,* as it did detraction in the *Edinburgh.* Southey's hand in *The Doctor* was not recognized by Lockhart, so he was far from tender with it, asserting that two-thirds of this "incoherent rhapsody" might have been penned in Bedlam. A reference in the next number of the Tory review must have been more pleasing to Southey's proud soul; for here it was said to be "rich beyond almost any other book of the times in the best knowledge and literature." Finally, in 1850, after Southey's death had removed the last obstacle to frankness, Lockhart admitted that the prolific author had not written for posterity, in spite of his own fatuous ambition—and the encouragement of *Quarterly* critics. Lockhart only gave utterance to what others of Southey's associates must long have felt.

ix

A review of *Marmion* in the *Edinburgh* in 1808 was one of the main reasons why Scott broke relations with the northern *Review.* Later evident attempts to belittle the value of Scott's poems, popular beyond all precedent in Great Britain, were deeply resented by the Tory group. George Ellis began in 1810 to answer the attacks of Jeffrey, defending Scott's itemizing method of description and his

[29] *Edinburgh Review,* XXII, 447.

use of the age of chivalry for his settings. He would only admit that the Scotchman was writing too rapidly and carelessly, a criticism that Wilson was also to make in *Blackwood's* from time to time, in otherwise favorable reviews. In 1811 Ellis again defends Scott, writing with the Whiggish reviews both of the *Lady of the Lake* and *Don Roderick* in mind. *Rokeby*, Ellis averred, would uphold Scott's reputation, altho at first reading it was a bit disappointing. In substance, this was also his view of the *Bridal of Triermain.* He gave as the reasons for Scott's popularity, his fertile sources of material, in the age of chivalry, his fecundity of imagination, profound learning, perfect good sense, and discriminating attention to the prevailing taste of his age and nation. Little was said of Scott's last poems.

Of Scott's novels, the first three reviews were lukewarm, if not slightly unfavorable. This may be regarded as a *faux pas* of Croker's, he being no doubt convinced that Scott was not the "Author of Waverley." Thus it came about that the first strongly favorable article in the *Quarterly* was written by Scott's own pen chiefly, and shows everywhere the adroitness in self-exploitation of which he was capable.[30] The next article, appearing after an interval of three years, when his fame was secure, is an unqualified panegyric on the "Great Unknown," whose work was above the influence of criticism and therefore had not always been discussed in the *Quarterly,* as the separate volumes appeared. The next was a wholly censorious treatment of the *Pirate,* while the last simply recognized him to be what he was by that time universally known as—the greatest living novelist.

[30] The doubts regarding Scott's authorship of this reveiw are set at rest by the reference to Murray's Register (see Appendix).

X

Lord Byron was the idol and the anathema of the Tory critics. Some of his liberal tendencies, especially after 1820, should have militated greatly against admiration from the *Quarterly* group. But Murray was Byron's publisher. He brought out the young poet after the latter, for a juvenile performance, had been severely castigated by the *Edinburgh* reviewer. Moreover, Byron was a Lord. He was no vulgar Hunt or Hazlitt, or obscure Keats. Politically, his conservative and aristocratic utterances were regarded as far more important than his occasional and protean democratic tendencies. Politics, however, may account for the fact that George Ellis's review of the first two cantos of *Childe Harold* has more of mild censure in it than of praise. But Ellis here expressed great faith in Byron's future. The unnatural ethics of the Giaour himself proved a stumbling block to unlimited *Quarterly* praise of the poem by that title, and the *Bride of Abydos* was considered superior to its companion-piece, because it did not contain a single offensive passage. In his third review of Byron, Ellis comes out boldly with praise unqualified. The *Corsair,* he considered the most finished and beautiful of Byron's productions. On the whole, this review was a very just and discerning treatment of the poet. Ellis never reviewed Byron again, but a greater took up the task—his rival, Scott. The Scotchman, in spite of the general ostracism of Byron at this time (1816), wrote of the *Prisoner of Chillon* and the third canto of *Childe Harold* the warmest tribute to Byron's genius that had appeared up to this date. And two years later Scott again took up his pen to appraise in his kindly way Byron's performance. He pointed out the great qualities in Byron's poetry and character, and expressed regret that the Englishman failed to find in the society of other human beings the happiness which he never found in himself.

The turning point in Tory appreciation came with the publication in 1819 of the first cantos of *Don Juan.* For several years the *Quarterly* was silent—to Southey's righteous indignation. Gifford had still a regard for his protégé, altho Murray ceased to publish the cantos after the fifth appeared. In 1822 Bishop Reginald Heber explained the silence, in a review of the dramas. It was because " they " could not without deep disappointment witness the prostitution of those splendid talents. The completeness of Byron's fall from grace can only be comprehended after a perusal of this forty-eight-page critique, and a comparison of this with the former eulogies by Scott and Ellis. The Tory *Review,* which had so long been the champion of Byron, now became his most thoro prosecutor. He sought for literary fame; but the Church, not literature, judged him. Finally, Lockhart, in a review of Moore's *Life* (1831) sought to render him justice, but adds little to previous criticisms except an expression of esteem for Byron's prose.

xi

After the notorious review of Keats, the best known of the *Quarterly's* severe verdicts is probably that pronounced in 1833 on the *Poems by Alfred Tennyson,* called forth on account of extravagant praise of an earlier volume in the Radical *Westminster Review,* the more just criticism of Leigh Hunt in the *Tatler,* and North's expressed attempt to save him from the Cockney School. Most commentators on Tennyson have agreed that his ten-year silence and the superiority of the poems of 1842 were partly due to this criticism. The *Quarterly* recognized the change for the better, and John Sterling reviewed the poems of 1842 very appreciatively; while in 1848 another reviewer praised the *Princess* and found the poet's faults inconsequential beside his " beauties."

xii

In the reviews of Carlyle may be found another failure of Tory criticism. This author, whose essay on Chartism had been unacceptable to the *Quarterly* in 1839, was, the following year, first reviewed by William Sewell. Sewell was a clergyman of the Established Church, and his critical judgments of the *Essays* (here lumped together for consideration) was grievously qualified by his desire to bring Carlyle more light and knowledge—to help him to a more definite understanding and profession of Christianity. The irritating assumption of a monopoly of moral and spiritual truth, so characteristic of the *Quarterly*, is nowhere more ridiculous than in this article. True literary verdicts cannot be expected from one who lamented Carlyle's failure to perceive the capacity of the Church for curing the social evils of England in 1840. And altho another writer praised *Sartor Resartus* (in 1847) lukewarmly for its genial humor, morality and "true philosophy," the *Quarterly* treatment of this author was woefully inadequate.

xiii

In the case of Macaulay, the grounds of antipathy were obvious. The essayist had in the *Edinburgh* (1831) "smashed" (his own word) Croker's *Boswell's Johnson*, which was published by Murray. Yet Milman reviewed favorably the *Lays of Ancient Rome* in 1843. This was fair enough. But the appearance of the first volumes of the *History* called forth in 1849 a savage retaliation for Macaulay's abuse of Croker. The reviewer, Croker himself, had to recognize his adversary's talents. But he found bad taste, bad feeling, and bad faith on every page of the *History*. Macaulay "sneered at Tories and Churchmen, and gave pain to all friends of the Protestant Establishment." He had borrowed without acknowledgment from

Mackintosh's *History*. He had produced a "narrative" that would be popular for a day, but would never be reread, and would never be quoted on any question or point of English history.

xiv

Finally, three great noveltists of the Nineteenth Century brought out clearly both the strength and the weakness of Tory criticism. The well-earned popularity of Dickens was acknowledged by Abraham Haywood in a review of *Pickwick Papers* in 1837, one of the most interesting articles to be found in the first fifty years of *Quarterly* criticism. By discovering and turning to account the rich and varied stores of mother-wit among the lower classes of London, whose vernacular had hitherto been despised as "unintelligible slang," this new genius had made himself a success, declared the reviewer. Yet he showed that Dickens grew commonplace the moment his foot was off the pavement of the city. Haywood's chief fear was that he wrote too fast and too much for durability. But Richard Ford, the critic of *Oliver Twist* in 1839, deprecated Dickens's reforming aim. Moreover, he objected to the drollery with which he treated crime and rascality, since these infamies feed the "innate evil principle" in the human heart. Ford feared greatly their effect on the youth of England. *Oliver Twist* was aimed "with much unfairness" at the Poor Laws and the work-house system.

Vanity Fair and *Jane Eyre* were reviewed together in 1848 by Miss Rigby (afterward Lady Eastlake), who had almost unqualified praise for the former. Miss Rigby's long interpretation of the character of Becky is a valuable bit of criticism; and her unhesitating estimate of the novel as one of the finest of its or any time, shows literary perspicacity. But, alas, she finds a fault in the fact that the

personages are so much like our everyday selves that we may not draw any distinct moral from them.[31]

This perversion of criticism is carried to its logical extreme in the section of the critique devoted to *Jane Eyre.* Miss Rigby finds Charlotte Bronte's work written with genuine power, but stamped with coarseness of language, laxity of tone, and execrable taste. Its popularity shows how deeply the love of illegitimate romance is implanted in our nature. The novelist had committed the highest moral offense possible, i.e., making an unworthy character interesting to the reader. Thruout the book, Jane rebelled against the privations of the poor, which, as far as the individual is concerned, is a murmuring against God's appointments. In conclusion, Miss Rigby declared, "The tone of mind and thought which has overthrown authority and violated every code human and divine abroad, and fostered Chartism and rebellion at home, is the same which has also written *Jane Eyre.*" And in the blind rage of detraction, the reviewer pronounces the author "no artist." Miss Rigby pointed out the highest qualities of *Vanity Fair* and *Jane Eyre*; pointed them out and objected to them. She assumed with Tory smugness that God had somehow deputized her and others of the Elect to guard the morals of the country. Aristocratic and religious prejudices again stood in the way of just literary criticism.

[31] Cf. the splendid appreciation of *The Newcomes* which appeared in 1855. *Quarterly Review,* XCVII, 350.

CONCLUSION

Critical manners have changed for the better. The oracular pronouncements of the "invisible infallibles," so long and slavishly regarded by readers, finally lost weight when an author's merit was stoutly contested by Whig and Tory reviewers. Sooner or later, with the anonymity and pretense of infallibility, went the old criterion, Taste. After *Quarterly* and *Edinburgh* and *Blackwood's* had disputed for a few years over the merits of Scott and Southey and the "Lakers," the public must have surmised with some satisfaction that there might be hopes for an author, even tho damned by "Judge Jeffrey," "Asmodeus Gifford," and "Christopher North."

As the critics sometimes misjudged the reviewed, so also they were themselves sometimes misjudged. Croker is a good example. Having condemned Keats for partisan reasons, in a notorious review, he is now remembered by posterity chiefly for this article—unrepresentative as it is, Croker was at times a very discerning critic. Yet his two excellent appreciations of Maria Edgeworth are forgotten, his really discerning criticisms of Scott are little known to the modern reader, as are his articles on Bonaparte and Wraxall and Waldegrave; his short, ill-advised (tho to some extent just) attack on Keats is found in every collection of old reviews. Even so Jeffrey lives—not for his best criticism but his worst.

It is now possible to explain historically (excepting always the personal element involved) the signal deficiencies of the *Quarterly* in evaluating much of that splendid out-flowering of literary genius between 1809 and 1853.

Little of its failure was the result of adherence to 18th Century pseudo-classical traditions. Defence of Scott and Southey and Byron soon weakened any devotion the Tory reviewers might have had toward outworn literary shibboleths based on the reputation of Pope and Dryden. Nor was personal animosity, tho this frequently developed in the course of a literary feud, very largely responsible. The rationale of *Quarterly* criticism is to be found in Tory reverence for the Crown, loyalty to the ancient constitution of the State, the aristocratical principle, "the defence of property (the Landed Interest) from the people," and fidelity to the apostolical hierarchy of the Church of England. For these, the Tory critics sacrificed all writers who referred disrespectfully to the "Good King"; all who showed admiration for Napoleon and the French, or any recognized enemies of England; all who were known to have inclinations toward liberalism in political thought, or beliefs which operated for the subversion of the existing order; all who seemed to exalt the lower classses or to encourage the mob to seek equality with "their betters"; and (the largest class of all) all who countenanced Dissent or Popery, or exhibited in their works signs of infidelity. The true principle of *Quarterly* criticism was to denounce as evil and mischievous the work (and the character as well) of any writer, whose doctrines were set against the "ancient order of things, as established by our fathers."

Yet it is not fair to the *Quarterly* reviewers to recall their failures alone; for much of their work was good—and it seems as if their favorable and constructive criticism has been underestimated in the century that has passed, with its working over and refining of literary evaluations. The truth is that very many of the appreciations of Wordsworth and Coleridge, Scott and Southey, Crabbe, Byron, Lamb, Jane Austen, Maria Edgeworth, Thomas Moore,

Campbell, Tennyson, Dickens, Thackeray, and our own Washington Irving, seem sound today, after the lapse of three-quarters of a century. Scott, Ellis, Whately, Lamb, Lyall, H. N. Coleridge, Henry Taylor and Croker (when unbiased) were no mean critics. And the manner in which later critics have endorsed or appropriated the pronouncements of these reviewers, is all the tribute needed to the value of such early judgments. That the critical dicta of the *Quarterly* were too often qualified by political prejudice or moral apprehension, even he who runs may read. That loyalty of Tory reviewers to each other often led them into absurd eulogy of works that have no value today, whatever vogue they may have had then, is unfortunate. But when all is said, the major part of their criticism is found to be sane and appreciative; and the facts remain that Byron's great fame, Scott's immense popularity, Jane Austen's later vogue, and Maria Edgeworth's earlier success, all owed something to the helpful criticism and endorsement of the *Quarterly*.[32]

If we can put ourselves back in the place of the Tory critics who abused Hunt and Hazlitt and Keats and Shelley, we must come to the conclusion that posterity has misjudged the reviewers almost as flagrantly as the latter misjudged the reviewed. Partisan prejudice was strong enough in that day to blind even the gallant and gentle Scott; for in 1825 he believed that to take notice of such men as Hunt and Hazlitt in the *Quarterly* was to introduce

[32] The influence of the *Quarterly's* verdicts to increase or lessen the sale of a book, can only be ascertained in a very general way. Some of the Tory readers would naturally be impressed by charges of immorality, infidelity, or Jacobinism, and some sales would thus be cut off. On the other hand, we have the testimonies of Macaulay, Keats, and others to the advertising value of a "slashing" review. On the whole, we have very few reliable data from which to determine the effects, either of Croker's vituperation or Southey's fulsome eulogies, on the sales of the works of their contemporaries.

them to a world scarcely conscious of their existence,[33] Moreover, the writers for the Tory organ, like "Judge Jeffrey's gang" and the "crew" of *Blackwood's,* were merely following the traditions of reviewers and observing the only critical manners with which they were acquainted. It is surely of importance to remember that the ungentlemanly broils with Hunt and Hazlitt were both begun by the two authors, not by Tory reviewers. The attacks on Keats and Shelley naturally followed, because of association with Hunt. Croker's trimming of Macaulay was only retaliation for the latter's earlier "smashing" review of Croker. Clearly, the faults of the *Quarterly* have been sufficiently dwelt upon. Like the unfortunate Croker, the *Review* of the early days is remembered by many readers for the four-page paper on *Endymion,* the attack on the callow Tennyson, or the castigation of Macaulay. But a few wrong sentences hastily given, in the courts of literary criticism, should not be allowed to outweigh many just verdicts.

APPENDIX

This list contains all the noteworthy critical reviews in the *Quarterly* between its beginning in 1809 and the end of Lockhart's editorship in 1853. No evidence is available regarding the authorship of the few omitted. About forty per cent. of the names of authors were compiled from various sources. These were verified and the remainder supplied by Mr. John Murray, of London, owner and publisher of the *Quarterly* at the present time, and possessor of the "Register."

[33] *Journal,* N. Y., 1891, p. 15.

Author Reviewed	Quarterly Review	Reviewer
JOSEPH ADDISON,		
Sir Roger de Coverley	XC, 285, Mar. 1852	Whitwell Elwin
JOHN AIKIN,		
On Song Writing	III, 481, May 1810	Walter Scott
JANE AUSTEN,		
Emma, a Novel	XIV, 188, Oct. 1815	Walter Scott
Northanger Abbey, and Persuasion	XXIV, 360, Jan. 1821	Richard Whately
JOANNA BAILLIE,		
Dramas	LV, 487, Feb. 1836	H. H. Milman
Fugitive Verses	LXVII, 437, Mar. 1841	Henry Nelson Coleridge
ANNA LETITIA BARBAULD,		
Eighteen Hundred and Eleven, a Poem	VII, 309, June 1812	J. W. Croker
BROOKE BOOTHBY,		
Fables and Satires	III, 43, Feb. 1810	Frank Sayers
GEORGE BORROW,		
The Bible in Spain	LXXI, 169, Dec. 1842	John Gibson Lockhart
WILLIAM LISLE BOWLES,		
Poems	II, 272, Nov. 1809	John Hoppner and William Gifford
Spence's Anecdotes and the Invariable Principles of Poetry	XXIII, 410, July 1820	Isaac D'Israeli
SIR THOMAS BROWNE,		
Works	LXXXIX, 364, Sept. 1851	Rev. E. S. Dixon
ELIZABETH BARRETT, etc.		
(Modern English Poetesses)	LXVI, 374, Sept. 1840	Henry Nelson Coleridge

Author Reviewed	Quarterly Review	Reviewer
CHARLOTTE BRONTE,		
Jane Eyre (with Vanity Fair)	LXVII, 153, Dec. 1848	Miss Rigby
FRANCES BURNEY,		
The Wanderer	XI, 123, Apr. 1814	J. W. Croker
Letters and Diaries of	LXX, 243, June 1842	J. W. Croker
ROBERT BURNS,		
Reliques of	I, 19, Feb. 1809	Walter Scott
LORD BYRON,		
Childe Harold, I and II	VII, 180, Mar. 1812	George Ellis
The Bride of Abydos	X, 331, June 1814	George Ellis
The Corsair (with Rogers's Lara)	XI, 428, July 1814	George Ellis
Childe Harold, III, and Prisoner of Chillon	XVI, 172, Oct. 1816	Walter Scott
Childe Harold, IV	XIX, 215, July 1818	Walter Scott
Dramas	XXVII, 476, July 1822	Reginald Heber
Lord Byron and His Contemporaries, by Leigh Hunt	XXXVII, 402, Mar. 1828	J. G. Lockhart
Life of Byron, by Thomas Moore	XLIV, 168, Feb. 1831	J. G. Lockhart
CAREW AND HERRICK,		
Poems	IV, 165, Aug. 1810	Barron Field
THOMAS CAMPBELL,		
Gertrude of Wyoming	I, 241, May 1809	Walter Scott
Theodoric	XXXI, 342, Mar. 1825	Rev. Edward Smedley
Life of Mrs. Siddons	LII, 95, Aug. 1834	J. W. Croker
Poems	LVII, 349, Dec. 1836	William Henry Smith
Life of Campbell	LXXXV, 32, Dec. 1849	J. G. Lockhart

Author Reviewed	Quarterly Review	Reviewer
THOMAS CARLYLE,		
Essays	XLVI, 446, Sept. 1840	Rev. William Sewell
"Pantagruelism"	LXXXI, 107, June 1847	Dr. J. W. Donaldson
ALEXANDER CHALMERS,		
Works of the English Poets	XI, 504, July 1814	Robert Southey
English Poets (revised edition)	XII, 60, Oct. 1814	Robert Southey
THOMAS CHALMERS,		
Life and Writings	XCI, 402, Sept. 1852	G. R. Gleig
JOHN CLARE,		
Poems	XXIII, 166, May 1820	O. G. Gilchrist
HARTLEY COLERIDGE,		
Poems	XLIX, 517, July 1833	J. G. Lockhart
SAMUEL TAYLOR COLERIDGE,		
Remorse	XI, 177, Aug. 1814	J. T. Coleridge
Poetical Works	LII, 1, Aug. 1834	H. N. Coleridge
Table Talk	LIII, 79, Feb. 1835	J. G. Lockhart
Literary Remains	LIX, 1, July 1837	H. N. Coleridge
GEORGE COLMAN,		
Poetical Vagaries	VIII, 144, Sept. 1812	J. W. Croker
Vagaries Vindicated	IX, 346, July 1813	J. W. Croker
JOHN PAYNE COLLIER,		
History of Dramatic Poetry	XLVI, 477, Jan. 1832	H. H. Milman
MARY COLLING,		
Poems	XLVII, 80, Mar. 1832	Robert Southey

Author Reviewed	Quarterly Review	Reviewer
JOSIAH CONDER,		
Sacred Poetry, etc.	XXXV, 241, Jan. 1827	John Keble
WILLIAM COWPER,		
Correspondence of	XXX, 185, Sept. 1823	Reginald Heber
GEORGE CRABBE,		
The Borough	IV, 283, Nov. 1810	William Gifford
Life of, by his Son	L, 468, Jan. 1834	J. G. Lockhart
Poems, Ed. by his Son	LII, 184, Aug. 1834	J. G. Lockhart
JOHN WILSON CROKER,		
The Battle of Talavera, a Poem	II, 416, Nov. 1809	Walter Scott
RICHARD CUMBERLAND,		
John De Lancaster	I, 337, May 1809	Walter Scott
LUCRETIA DAVIDSON,		
Remains of	XLI, 289, Nov. 1829	Robert Southey
CHARLES DICKENS,		
Pickwick Papers	LIX, 484, Oct. 1837	Abraham Hayward
Oliver Twist	LXIV, 83, June 1839	Richard Ford
American Notes	LXXI, 502, Mar. 1843	J. W. Croker
ISAAC D'ISRAELI,		
Calamities of Authors	VIII, 93, Sept. 1812	Robert Southey
Curiosities of Literature	XXIII, 245, May 1820	Thomas Mitchell
ROB DONN,		
Poems	XLV, 358, July 1831	J. G. Lockhart
NATHAN DRAKE,		
Essays on Tatler, Spectator, etc.	I, 398, May 1809	Isaac D'Israeli

Author Reviewed	Quarterly Review	Reviewer
JOHN DUNLOP,		
History of Fiction	XIII, 384, July 1815	Francis Palgrave (Cohen)
MARIA EDGEWORTH,		
Tales of Fashionable Life, I–III	II, 135, Aug. 1809	J. W. Croker
Tales of Fashionable Life, IV–VI	VII, 329, June 1812	J. W. Croker
Memoirs of R. L. Edgeworth	XXV, 510, July 1820	J. W. Croker
Patronage	X, 301, Jan. 1814	J. W. Ward
Children's Books, etc.	LXXIV, 1, Dec. 1842	Miss Rigby
JOHN EVELYN,		
Memoirs	XIX, 1, Apr. 1818	Robert Southey
JAMES FORBES,		
Oriental Memoirs	XII, 180, Oct. 1814	Robert Southey
JOHN FORD,		
Dramatic Works	VI, 462, Dec. 1811	William Gifford
JOHN HOOKHAM FRERE,		
Prospectus and Specimen of intended National Work, by William and Robert Whistlecraft	XXI, 486, Aug. 1820	Ugo Foscolo
JOHN GALT,		
Annals of the Parish	XXV, 147, April 1821	J. W. Croker
WILLIAM GODWIN,		
Mandeville	XVIII, 176, Oct. 1817	J. W. Croker
EDWARD GIBBON,		
Works	XII, 368, Jan. 1815	T. D. Whitaker

Author Reviewed	Quarterly Review	Reviewer
OLIVER GOLDSMITH,		
Life and Works	LVII, 273, Dec. 1836	J. G. Lockhart
JAMES GRAHAME,		
British Georgics	III, 456, May 1810	Robert Southey
WILLIAM HAZLITT,		
The Round Table	XVII, 154, Apr. 1817	James Russell
Lectures on the English Lake Poets	XIX, 424, July 1818	James Russell
Political Essays	XXII, 15, Nov. 1820	William Gifford
Table Talk	XXVI, 103, Oct. 1822	John Matthews
ROBERT HERRICK,		
Poems	IV, 165, Aug. 1810	Barron Field
JOHN HOME,		
Works	XXXVI, 167, June 1827	Walter Scott
THEODORE HOOK,		
Novels of	LXXII, 53, May 1843	J. G. Lockhart
THOMAS HOPE,		
Anastasius	XXIV, 511, Jan. 1821	William Gifford
LEIGH HUNT,		
The Story of Rimini	XIV, 473, Jan. 1816	J. W. Croker
Foliage	XVIII, 324, May 1818	J. W. Croker
Tasso's Jerusalem Delivered (trans.)	XXV, 427, July 1821	Reginald Heber
Byron and His Contemporaries	XXXVII, 402, Mar. 1828	J. G. Lockhart
WASHINGTON IRVING,		
The Sketch Book	XXV, 50, Apr. 1821	Henry Matthews
Salmagundi, etc.	XXXI, 473, Mar. 1825	Canon Hughes

Author Reviewed	Quarterly Review	Reviewer
Conquest of Granada	XLIII, 55, May 1830	Irving himself
FRANCIS JEFFREY,		
Cockburn's Life of Jeffrey	XCI, 105, June 1852	J. G. Lockhart (and another)
SAMUEL JOHNSON,		
Croker's Edition of Boswell's Life	XLVI, 1, Nov. 1831	J. G. Lockhart
JOHN JONES,		
Lives of Uneducated Poets (with introduction by Southey)	XLIV, 52, Jan. 1831	J. G. Lockhart
STEPHEN JONES,		
Biographia Dramatica	VII, 282, June 1812	O. G. Gilchrist
"JUNIUS,"		
Letters of	XC, 91, Dec. 1851	W. T. Coulton
JOHN KEATS,		
Endymion	XIX, 204, Apr. 1818	J. W. Croker
FANNY KEMBLE,		
Francis the First	XLVII, 243, Mar. 1832	H. H. Milman
CHARLES LAMB,		
Last Essays of Elia	LIV, 58, July 1835	H. N. Coleridge
WALTER SAVAGE LANDOR,		
Count Julian	VIII, 86, Sept. 1812	Robert Southey
Imaginary Conversations	XXX, 516, Jan. 1824	Henry Taylor
Imaginary Conversations	LVIII, 108, Feb. 1837	William Smith
THOMAS BABINGTON MACAULAY,		
Lays of Ancient Rome	LXXII, 453, Sept. 1843	H. H. Milman
History of England	LXXXIV, 549, Mar. 1849	J. W. Croker

Author Reviewed	Quarterly Review	Reviewer
WILLIAM MASON,		
Works	XV, 376, July 1816	Dr. T. D. Whitaker
CHARLES ROBERT MATURIN,		
The Fatal Revenge	III, 339, May 1810	Walter Scott
Women, a Tale	XIX, 321, July 1818	J. W. Croker
Melmoth the Wanderer	XXIV, 303, Jan. 1821	J. W. Croker
HENRY HART MILMAN,		
Judicium Regale and Fazio	XV, 69, Apr. 1816	J. T. Coleridge
The Fall of Jerusalem	XXIII, 198, May 1820	Reginald Heber
Anne Boleyn	XXXII, 351, Sept. 1825	John A. Heraud
RICHARD MONCKTON MILNES,		
Works	LXIV, 59, June 1839	J. G. Lockhart
JOHN MILTON,		
Works	XXXVI, 29, June 1827	J. J. Blunt
MARY RUSSELL MITFORD,		
Poems	IV, 514, Nov. 1810	Rev. John Mitford (her father)
Village Sketches	XXXI, 166, Dec. 1824	Captain Procter
MARY WORTLEY MONTAGU,		
Letters and Works	LVIII, 147, Feb. 1857	J. W. Croker
JAMES MONTGOMERY,		
The West Indies and other Poems	VI, 405, Dec. 1811	Robert Southey
The World Before the Flood	XI, 78, Apr. 1814	Robert Southey
THOMAS MOORE,		
Irish Melodies	VII, 374, June 1812	Horace Twiss
Irish Melodies	XXVIII, 139, Oct. 1822	Henry Taylor

Author Reviewed	Quarterly Review	Reviewer
Life of Byron	XLIV, 168, Jan. 1831	J. G. Lockhart
Life of Fitzgerald	XLVI, 213, Nov. 1831	J. W. Croker
ALICIA TINDAL PALMER,		
The Daughters of Isenberg	IV, 61, Aug. 1810	William Gifford
SAMUEL PEPYS,		
Diary	XXXIII, 281, Mar. 1826	Walter Scott
RICHARD POLWHELE,		
The Fair Isabel of Cotchele	XIV, 402, Aug. 1816	Walter Scott
SAMUEL ROGERS,		
Poems	IX, 207, Mar. 1813	J. W. Ward
Lara (with Byron's Corsair)	XI, 428, July 1814	George Ellis
LORD JOHN RUSSELL,		
Don Carlos	XXIX, 370, July 1823	Henry Taylor
FRANK SAYERS,		
Works	XXXV, 175, Jan. 1827	Robert Southey
WALTER SCOTT,		
The Lady of the Lake	III, 493, May 1810	George Ellis
The Vision of Don Roderick	VI, 221, Oct. 1811	William Erskine?
Rokeby	VIII, 485, Dec. 1812	George Ellis
The Bridal of Triermain	IX, 480, July 1813	George Ellis
Waverley	XI, 354, July 1814	J. W. Croker
Guy Mannering	XII, 501, Jan. 1815	J. W. Croker
The Lord of the Isles	XIII, 287, July 1815	George Ellis

Author Reviewed	Quarterly Review	Reviewer
The Antiquary	XV, 125, Apr. 1816	J. W. Croker
Tales of My Landlord	XVI, 430, Jan. 1817	Scott (Gifford and Erskine?)
Rob Roy, Tales of My Landlord, second series	XXVI, 109, Jan. 1822	Richard Whately
The Pirate	XXVI, 454, April 1822	Nassau Senior
Lives of the Novelists	XXXIV, 349, Sept. 1826	J. G. Lockhart
WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE,		
Recent Editions (Knight, Collier, etc.)	LXXV, 310, June 1845	Whitwell Elwin
JAMES SHIRLEY,		
Gifford's Edition of	XLIX, 1, Apr. 1833	H. H. Milman
RICHARD SHEIL,		
Tragic Drama, The Apostate	XVII, 248, Apr. 1817	Charles Robert Maturin
Evadne, or The Statue	XXII, 402, Jan. 1820	J. T. Coleridge
PERCY BYSSHE SHELLEY,		
Laon and Cythna	XXI, 469, Apr. 1819	J. T. Coleridge
Prometheus Unbound	XXVI, 168, Oct. 1822	W. S. Walker
Faust, and Posthumous Poems	XXXIV, 136, June 1826	J. G. Lockhart
MARY SHELLEY,		
Frankenstein	XVIII, 379, May 1818	J. W. Croker
SIR PHILIP SIDNEY,		
Memoirs of	I, 77, Feb. 1809	Isaac D'Israeli
HORACE AND JAMES SMITH,		
Rejected Addresses	VIII, 172, Sept. 1812	J. W. Croker
ROBERT SOUTHEY,		
Chronicle of the Cid	I, 134, Feb. 1809	Walter Scott
History of Brazil	IV, 454, Nov. 1810	Reginald Heber

Author Reviewed	Quarterly Review	Reviewer
The Curse of Kehama	V, 40, Feb. 1811	Walter Scott
Roderick, the Last of the Goths	XIII, 83, Apr. 1815	Grosvenor Bedford
Life of Wesley	XXIV, 1, Oct. 1821	Reginald Heber
The Tale of Paraguay	XXXII, 457, Oct. 1825	J. T. Coleridge
Sir Thomas More, or Colloquies on the Progress and Prospects of Society	XLI, 1, July 1828	J. J. Blunt
The Doctor	LI, 68, Mar. 1834	J. G. Lockhart
Life of, by C. C. Southey	LXXXVIII, 197, Dec. 1850	J. G. Lockhart (and others)
JOHN STERLING,		
Poems	LXVI, 156, June 1840	H. N. Coleridge
JONATHAN SWIFT,		
Earlier Life of	I, 162, Feb. 1809	Walter Scott?
HENRY TAYLOR,		
Isaac Comnenus	XXXVIII, 442, Oct. 1828	J. G. Lockhart
Philip van Artevelde	LI, 365, June 1834	J. G. Lockhart
Edwin the Fair	LXXII, 347, Sept. 1843	Aubrey de Vere
ALFRED TENNYSON,		
Poems	XLIX, 81, Apr. 1833	J. W. Croker
Poems (1842)	LXX, 385, Sept. 1842	John Sterling
WILLIAM MAKEPEACE THACKERAY,		
Vanity Fair (with Jane Eyre)	LXVII, 153, Dec. 1848	Miss Rigby
MRS. FRANCES TROLLOPE,		
Domestic Manners of the Americans	XLVII, 39, Mar. 1832	Basil Hall
The Refugee in America	XLVIII, 507, Dec. 1832	William Jacob

Author Reviewed	Quarterly Review	Reviewer
HORACE WALPOLE,		
Letters to George Montagu	XIX, 118, Apr. 1818	Walter Scott
WILLIAM WARBURTON,		
Works	VII, 397, June 1812	T. D. Whitaker
J. WEDDERBOURNE WEBSTER,		
Waterloo	XV, 345, July 1816	J. W. Croker
BLANCO WHITE,		
Autobiography	LXXVI, 167, June 1845	W. E. Gladstone
WILLIAM WORDSWORTH,		
The Excursion	XII, 100, Oct. 1814	Charles Lamb (and Gifford)
Poems of 1815, and the White Doe of Rylstone	XIV, 201. Oct. 1815	William Rowe Lyall
Poetical Works	LII, 317, Nov. 1834	Henry Taylor
Yarrow Revisited, etc.	LIV, 181, July 1835	H. N. Coleridge?
Sonnets	LXIX, 1, Dec. 1841	Henry Taylor
Memoirs, by Christopher Wordsworth	XCII, 182, Dec. 1852	Whitwell Elwin?

VITA

Walter James Graham was born in Waldoboro, Maine, April 17, 1885, son of Emily Cox and Rev. James Graham; attended Yarmouth High School; received the degree of A.B. from Bates College in 1911, and that of A.M. from Columbia University in 1912; was University Scholar and University Fellow at Columbia, and Assistant in English at Barnard College; completed residence work for Ph.D. degree in June, 1916; is now Assistant Professor of English in Western Reserve University. He is author of *Notes for Young Writers,* 1918 (Harper & Brothers), *Double Falsehood,* a new edition with critical introduction, 1920 (Publications of Western Reserve University), and numerous articles in English publications.

Stanford University Libraries
Stanford, California

Return this book on or before date due.